Waste Management Program Redesign Conference Call
August 2, 2004 9am

Present: John Melby, Larry Lynch, Dave Hildreth, Frank Schultz, Barb Hennings (notetaker), Connie Antonuk, Dennis Mack
Absent: Sue Bangert, Mike Degen, Deb Pingel, Cynthia Moore

The purpose of the meeting was to finalize the meeting minutes from July 7, 2004 and review three issues briefs that would be taken to the Waste Management Team for further consideration. Two other briefs were not available for discussion.

There was consensus on the July meeting notes and if anyone had any changes to get them to Dave Hildreth by noon today, Dave will send Barb those minutes so they can be posted.

The three issue briefs are based on the discussion/matrix prepared at the July 7, 2004 monthly meeting.

1. Short-term Information Technology Work Items: IT Issue Paper
   Prepared by: Bangert, Carlson, Sissons
   Concerns: funding, whether SHWIMS is ready for public consumption.
   Decision: Everyone was in agreement that this item should go forward for the Waste Management Team to prioritize the bulleted items.

2. Single Company Approval for Solid Waste Landfills: Single Company Issue Paper
   Prepared by: Mack, Lynch, Schultz
   Concerns: A single review team working on a single approval for a large company would be disruptive within the current program structure; Frank suggested that the review team not necessarily be realigned but that the teams work together as for the Safety Kleen relicensing. Barb was concerned that the status of plan review needs to be finalized prior to an undertaking like this and that enforcement issues need to be addressed as well. Larry suggested a "coordinator" that could work with the review teams. People were OK with the concept but felt it was premature as well as not being the best timing.
   Decision: Dennis will add these additional concerns to the issue paper and say that we need input about this concept from the WaMT but that we are requesting no action at this time.

3. Implementing Green Tier in the Waste Management Program: Green Tier Issue Paper
   Prepared by: Hildreth, Degen
   Concerns: There was general consensus that the program would have to participate in Green Tier eventaully and that piloting the process with a group like the Scrap Metal Receyclers would be good. Concerns for enforcement and needed skillsets were expressed. The program should be looking at identifying people to participate in the upcoming Green Tier brainstorming sessions.
   Decision: The issue will be presented to the WaMT in a discuss/decide decision mode.

4. Landfill Plan Review Evaluation (Antonuk, Bangert, Hennings) and Recycling Issues (Moore, Lynch, Pingel) were not ready for discussion.

Frank asked whether he needed to do additional work on his table summarizing lessons learned from guest speakers. We decided that before trying to summarize the information further, he should review and coordinate his work with the focus group information when it becomes available.

Reminder of the August 11 meeting in Madison, August 20 in Stevens Point and finally, August 23 in Wausau for those attending the Wauleco project.

Note that the Issue Papers presented to the Waste Management Team on August 12 are substantially the same as those contained in this document.

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REDESIGN TEAM ISSUE BRIEF

Back to Meeting Minutes

ISSUE: Short-term Information Technology Work Items

METHOD:

DECISION MODE:

PRESENTER: Sue Bangert

CHARGE/SIDEBOARDS: IT-related activities that affect program and can be initiated prior to conclusion of program redesign process.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend that WaMT prioritize the implementation of the short-term IT-related activities detailed below as a means of drawing attention to program and program data issues and leveraging additional resources for IT in the Waste Management program.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (include responses on why do we need to do this and how will this help us): There are a number of IT-related initiatives that the Waste Management program has been working on or could begin to work on in the near term that have the potential to help program resource allocation, address current stakeholder concerns, and/or raise the awareness amongst stakeholders and decision-makers of the importance of our data and data systems and the need for additional resources. The identified short-term IT-related initiatives proposed for prioritization (in no particular order) are as follows:

- SHWIMS on the Web
- GEMS on the Web
- Electronically accessible facility approval packages (pilot project)
- SHWIMS structural updates
- Electronic submittal of hazardous waste manifest data from TSDs
- Recycling grant applications on the Web
- GEMS bad submittal batch handling module
- Non-metallic mining fee submittal/tracking module

Descriptions of each of these initiatives are provided in the attached files.

It should be recognized that the program has embarked on an IT strategic planning process and is working toward developing a statewide program conceptual data model with the goal of developing a better understanding of the program's business processes and information management needs. These suggested short-term initiatives were not identified based upon a strategic IT assessment process; rather, they reflect a strategic concept to move important developments forward in an attempt to demonstrate responsiveness to identified needs and to leverage additional resources in the future. It is possible that as the program develops a better understanding of its business processes and IT needs that some of the products from these suggested initiatives would be of limited future use. It is important to recognize that the knowledge gained in the process of achieving these initiatives would persist and be usable in the context of future IT initiatives.

POTENTIAL KEY MEMBERS/PARTNERS *(If appropriate)*:

OUTCOME:

PREPARED BY: Chris Carlson and John Sissons

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:
GEMS on the Web
SHWIMS on the Web
SHWIMS Modifications
Recycling Grant Applications on the Web
GEMS Bad Submittal Batch Handling Module
Electronic Approval Packages Pilot
Nonmetallic Mining Fees Module
Electronic TSD Data

DATE: July 28, 2004

Single Company Approval for Solid Waste Landfills

Back to Meeting Minutes

What & Why: The Waste Management Program could approach one of the two big waste companies with multiple landfills in Wisconsin (Waste Management or Onyx) to see if they are interested in pursuing a single Waste Program approval and a single Waste Program review team covering all of their landfills. To keep things manageable, at least for the short-term, this approval would not cover other non-landfill solid waste facilities that the company operates. This approach could increase efficiency and consistency for both parties. It could also ultimately serve as a model that could be extended to other big Waste Companies and to large counties.

How: Assuming one of the companies is interested, we would assign a review team consisting of 2 to 6 people to the chosen company's landfills. The team would consist of a one or more hydros and engineers and possibly one or two waste management specialists. Members would be chosen irrespective of their work station or assignment to a region versus the central office. They would begin working with the company to consolidate all approvals for the company's landfills. The review team would also handle all new plan reviews for the company's landfills We would set a multiple-year time period for this trial with the idea that it would be made permanent if successful.

Workload: In the short-term (six months or more), a great deal of work would have to be expended by the review team our team to consolidate all approvals and to become familiar with their new sites. Our program attorney would also have to spend significant time on this project. Other staff would have to pick up some or all of the sites previously handled by members of members of the review team.

Skill Sets: Since the landfills in question would be among the largest and most technically demanding in the state, it seems probable that the Waste Management Program would want to assign some of its most competent, productive staff.

Issues/Considerations:

1. The Waste Management Team would have to determine:
   - membership of such a team
   - how members would be replaced
   - how work units "losing" staff to such a review team would be compensated
   - how supervision of these staff would be handled
   - how this team would relate to our existing program structure

   These staffing/personnel issues would not be easy issues to resolve.

2. External stakeholders would want a voice in determining the composition of our review team. They likely would not pick the same people we would be inclined to select.

3. The review team would likely be geographically further from their landfills than current review staff.

4. Some hard feelings may result when landfills are taken from currently assigned staff and given to a review team.

5. As previously mentioned, it would likely be necessary to cross existing program organizational and geographic boundaries in order for this approach to be successful. This would be the case in naming members to the review team and could also occur when reassigning sites previously assigned to the review team members.

6. With a single approval for multiple landfills, details would need to be worked out on issues like siting of new waste disposal capacity, enforcement, financial assurance, monitoring data submittal and record keeping.

7. Membership on the "review team" may provide additional "protection" during future budget/staff reductions. WaMT members will be fighting to protect their staff by putting them on the team, and staff left off will carry the stigma of not being good enough for the team.

8. Not clear how much efficiency this single approval/single review team approach would achieve in and of itself.

9. An alternative that may reduce some of the personnel-related concerns would be to leave current staff assignments for the company's landfills unchanged, but appoint a Coordinator for all of the company's landfill reviews.

WASTE MANAGEMENT TEAM ISSUE BRIEF

Back to Meeting Minutes

ISSUE: Implementing Green Tier in the Waste Management Program

METHOD: Discuss and Approve

DECISION MODE: ????

PRESENTER: Dave Hildreth and Mike Degen

CHARGE/SIDEBOARDS *(If appropriate)*

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt a Waste Management Program policy position that acknowledges Green Tier as an appropriate means to bring regulatory innovation to the Waste Management Program. Coordinate with CEA to identify reasonable short and long term objectives. The Program will work with eligible stakeholders to put into place pilot charters and other such agreements that serve to encourage going beyond compliance. The success of pilot efforts will lead to further Waste Program involvement in Green Tier. The Program will identify and develop a means of publicizing its support and participation in the Green Tier program.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: In the course of the Program Redesign discussions, ideas and suggestions were brought up that would serve to demonstrate the program's commitment to collaboration and innovation. Green Tier is one of those ideas. The Redesign Team evaluated this and other suggestions and agreed that it would be appropriate at this time to recommend to the Waste Management Team that we pursue Green Tier pilot(s) with eligible and willing stakeholders.

POTENTIAL KEY MEMBERS/PARTNERS: The Scrap Metal Recycling Association is one example of a group that would be a good candidate as they have already expressed an interest, have demonstrated success in establishing a industry-wide framework for achieving voluntary compliance and have begun working with DNR staff on a draft charter. There may be other stakeholders who are eligible and willing to participate in a pilot.

OUTCOME:

-Continue work on developing a charter with the Scrap Metal Recycling Association and possibly begin work with a very limited number of other interested and eligible stakeholders.
-Develop an appropriate means of making public our policy of support for Green Tier.
-Assign necessary program resources to this effort.

PREPARED BY: Dave Hildreth and Mike Degen

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:
Green Tier Fact Sheet – Performance Based Environmental Management
Green Tier Fact Sheet – The Environmental Case for Green Tier
Green Tier Fact Sheet – The Business Case for Green Tier
Green Tier Fact Sheet – Compliance Audits

DATE: August 12, 2004

Back to Issue Paper

GEMS on the Web

What (advantages & disadvantages): The program has been working over the last 12-24 months to begin to make GEMS information accessible via the Web. The basic prototype of one query routine has been developed based upon the Crandon Database on the Web. The GEMS Subteam is in the process of developing a workplan to complete the content development for the associated Web pages. Once that is complete, the query tool will be made available to the WaMT and others for final review prior to making it available to the public. As resources become available, the limited query capabilities are expected to be enhanced with additional options.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort, and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of the application developed for the Web would need to be modified in the future to continue to function.

How & When: This effort is spearheaded by the GEMS Subteam Leader Mike Zillmer and Chris Carlson, and involves the GEMS programmer, Steve Devoe, the GEMS file manager, John Sissons, and Barb Hennings, with input from the rest of the GEMS Subteam. If the page content can be completed by the end of September, the prototype could be made available before the end of October and the application could be functional shortly thereafter.

Workload/Resources: The page-content development workload could be as much as 20 hours or more for Mike Zillmer and Chris Carlson. There would then be less than four hours time for Steve Devoe to finish a prototype for evaluation. A total of less than 20 hours would then be needed for evaluation by the GEMS Subteam and the WaMT. Following authorization to take the application to the Internet, it is estimated that 10-20 hours of time for Steve Devoe will be needed to finish the work.

Back to Issue Paper

SHWIMS on the Web

What (advantages & disadvantages): The Waste Management Program has received requests from both internal and external stakeholders to make SHWIMS information accessible via the Web. We have received some assurances from the division and RR that some support for this effort can be made available from sources other than the Waste Management Program. These assurances, along with possible synergy with the ongoing BRRTS on the Web redesign effort, create an opportunity to move this concept along relatively quickly.

It is currently anticipated, for data and network protection reasons, that this access would be restricted to query-only capabilities. Due to privacy concerns and potential issues with data quality in parts of the system an evaluation of the fields to be made accessible will be necessary, and some fields will be restricted from being displayed through the Web interface.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort, the program data modeling effort, and the associated suggestion to pursue some structural changes to SHWIMS could necessitate that some or all of the application developed for the Web would need to be modified in the future to continue to function.

How & When: This effort would be spearheaded by the Division Data Coordinator, Dale Ziege, and involve the BRRTS on the Web programmer, Jim Buell, the SHWIMS File Manager, Aggie Cook, and Chris Carlson, with input from the SHWIMS users group (the PAs). Assuming the cross-program issues are resolved, this could result in a prototype before the end of the year and a functional application early in 2005.

Workload/Resources: The initial additional workload could be as much as 40 hours or more for Chris Carlson and Aggie Cook, as they work with Jim Buell to map out the existing system, identify the fields of interest, and scope out the look and feel of the application. After a prototype is built, there will be 25 or more hours of time needed by Aggie Cook and Chris Carlson for QA. Then some time will be needed by the SHWIMS users group and the WaMT to get familiar with the application and identify any issues. The program may need to make some additional resources available to help cover some of Jim Buell's time toward this effort. It is unclear at this time what that might be.

Back to Issue Paper

SHWIMS Structural Updates

What (advantages & disadvantages): Over the past several months, as the Waste Management Program has begun to develop program measurement and tracking tools, it has become clear that SHWIMS is not appropriately storing in a readily accessible format some of the information that has been identified as needed. Some of the information of interest includes approved capacity at landfills and historical information on numbers of licensed haulers and TSDs, and numbers and types of hazardous waste generators. It is important that this effort move forward to ensure that we are capturing appropriate information in our database for the future.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort, and the program data modeling effort could necessitate additional structural changes to SHWIMS that may or may not be aligned with the modified structure.

How & When: This effort would be lead by Aggie Cook and Chris Carlson, with input from the SHWIMS users group (the PAs), the BMT, and the Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Team Leaders. The first step in the process would involve identifying all of the changes that may be appropriate for SHWIMS and a prioritization of those that are likely to be most beneficial for the program to implement in the near term and most costly to leave for after the redesign and data modeling processes are complete. The next step would be an assessment of the costs involved in implementing the changes and a determination of the budget available to complete the work. It is expected that a prioritized list of enhancements could be available by the middle of October, with staged implementation occurring soon after.

Workload/Resources: The initial additional workload could be as much as 40 hours or more for Chris Carlson and Aggie Cook, as they work with the SHWIMS users group (the PAs), the BMT, and the Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Team Leaders to identify the scope of potential enhancements for SHWIMS and develop a prioritization of the list. Once that was completed, the programmer, Kathy Mooney, would be able to provide us with estimates of what it would take to implement those enhancements. Once it was clear what could be accomplished given the priorities and programming resources available, Kathy Mooney could implement the highest priority items.

Back to Issue Paper

Recycling Grant Applications on the Web

What (advantages & disadvantages): This year, in collaboration with UW Extension SHWEC, the Waste Management Program was able to pilot a Web data collection tool for recycling annual reports. To continue this collaboration and collect more data electronically, as well as reduce staff data entry time, the Recycling Team, with members from both CFA and the Waste programs, has decided to move forward into the area of electronic grant applications. It is proposed to combine the grant application process, currently paper, with the Web annual reporting application that has already been developed. The Recycling Team was very encouraged by the first effort at annual report data collection with almost 40 participants. It is expected to grow to serve approximately 400 Responsible Units (RUs) in 2005.

This enhancement to the existing SHWEC system would promote customer service as well as staff resource efficiency with limited contribution needed from Waste and CFA staff. CFA already has a considerable investment in electronic forms but currently they are "fill and print," and data must still be entered by hand once it is received in central office by the Department. The Web application, however, would allow the data to come into the Department electronically in a batch form.

There is an inherent lack of control in collaborative efforts, such as this one with SHWEC, which necessitates common vision and commitment on the part of all participants. It is possible that it will be necessary for the Waste Program to bring the data collection back "in house" in the future if this commonality ceases or resources for maintaining the data collection tools are reduced or removed. It must be realized that the potential migration of the finished data collection tools could be of considerable cost to replicate, given that the finished product implementation was built with tools that are not part of the Department's standard tool set. It is also possible that the on-going program redesign effort, and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of the Recycling Web data collection tools that have and will be developed would need to be modified or even dropped in the future.

How & When: This effort is sponsored by the Recycling Team Leader Cynthia Moore and the CFA Grants section Chief Mary Rose Teves. It would involve the Recycling programmer, Tim Oakes, the Recycling file manager, John Sissons, the CFA Recycling Grants Manager, currently Tom Nowakowski and the grants PA Diane Glodoski. It would also involve UW Extension SHWEC participation, lead by Steve Brachman. If the initial analysis and design were completed by the end of February 2005, the pilot Web Recycling Grants application pages would be available in time for the next grant cycle, which starts in mid July of 2005. This project would coincide and integrate with continuing redesign and enhancement to the existing annual report data collection tool because of changes to NR 544. Those changes need to be in place by March 1, 2005, and are already committed to by SHWEC and the Waste Program.

Workload/Resources: The analysis and initial design workload could require as little as 10 hours for John Sissons or as many as 30 if SHWEC is unable to use Kwnankamol Nongpong, the same programmer that worked on the pilot annual report project. There would then be 10 - 15 hours needed for Tim Oakes to design, test, and implement a data transfer protocol. A total of less than 20 hours would be needed for input and evaluation by the Recycling Team and CFA grants staff. Total programming time for SHWEC programmers would be 200 hours or more, again dependent upon programmer familiarity with the existing Web data collection tool.

Back to Issue Paper

GEMS Bad Submittal Batch Handling Module

What (advantages & disadvantages): The current GEMS submittal batch handling starts with an upload in central office by program assistant staff. If there are problems with the batch, it is transferred to the GEMS upload technician, a central office 1/4 time position, for follow up, possibly with the original submitter of the data. Often times this approach is not responsive, enough to staff or submitters, to enable prompt decision making. The GEMS Subteam has approved an enhancement to the batch processing module that would provide notification to assigned staff that a batch had been uploaded and either did or did not pass the edit checks. If it did not, the module would further enable assigned staff to "check out" the submittal themselves to follow up. The submitted paperwork would be automatically requested and routed to them and the original data file made available to them.

This module requires enhancements to the GEMS application, to the GEMS network fileshare, and requires documentation and training to be developed for affected staff. This module could obviate the need for Central Office follow up on bad batches, which could release additional staff resources. However, the workload would then be placed upon regional staff, with an additional drawback because bad batch handling could lose consistency. The module is intended to facilitate staff responsiveness to regulated entities and to enhance efficiency throughout the decision-making process. It is possible that it may be used in different ways within each of the regions.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort, and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of the submittal batch handling process that has and will be developed would need to be modified in the future to continue to function and meet broadening program needs.

How & When: This effort is sponsored by the entire GEMS Subteam and involves the GEMS programmer, Steve Devoe, the GEMS file manager, John Sissons, Barb Hennings, the current upload technicians in Central Office, Wayne Ringquist and Lindsey Miller, and input from the rest of the GEMS Subteam. If the initial analysis and design is completed by the end of September, the test module would be available early December and the application could be functional, in January 2005.

Workload/Resources: The analysis and initial design workload could be as much as 10 hours or more for John Sissons with 2 or less hours of time from Barb Hennings and other GEMS Subteam staff input. There would then be 20 hours time for Steve Devoe to finish a test prototype for staff evaluation. A total of less than five hours would then be needed for evaluation by the GEMS Subteam. Bug fixes and modifications to the initial design, and migration to production, would require 10 more hours of Steve and John's time. Total programming time 40 hours. Total GEMS Subteam staff contribution 10 hours or less.

Back to Issue Paper

Electronically accessible Facility Approval Packages (pilot project)

What (advantages & disadvantages): As a part of decentralization efforts, the Waste Management Program has relocated all project files to regional offices and/or service centers. This has made access to some files more difficult. In addition, the Program has received some inquiries from some stakeholders regarding access to facility approval conditions. Recognizing that the program is likely to begin addressing the need for a comprehensive electronic document management system through the data modeling effort, it is possible to take some steps forward to help identify the nature and extent of the effort involved in the short term. This would involve a pilot project, possibly in Northern Region, to convert the approval packages for all operating facilities in one region. This would start with active landfills and progress through the remainder of facilities that received approvals in order to operate. It is anticipated that the approval packages would be scanned into PDF format, with each document created as a separate file. The information would then be displayed on the Web, Intranet and possibly Internet, with a listing of all facilities and a linked page for each facilities showing all of the approvals for that facility. This pilot effort could then be accessed and reviewed to identify issues and problems that could be addressed through our future electronic document management system.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of this effort would need to be modified in the future.

How & When: This effort would be led by Chris Carlson, with the involvement of John Sissons, the PA in the region selected for the pilot, the field staff for that region, and the program Web Publisher, Vera Swanson. Should this pilot be included in upcoming program activities, the project could be outlined by October and implemented before the end of the fiscal year should Northern Region be selected for the pilot.

Workload/Resources: The initial additional workload could be as much as 20 hours or more for Chris Carlson and John Sissons, and up to 5 hours each for regional staff. It is expected to require 40 or more hours to gather, scan and return the approval packages for all operating facilities in Northern Region. It is expected to take 20 or more hours for Vera Swanson to design and program the necessary Web pages and get them approved by the Department for posting.

Back to Issue Paper

Nonmetallic Mining Fees Module

What (advantages & disadvantages): The Waste Management Program has been tracking nonmetallic mining annual report data from regulating authorities (RAs) for three years. RAs also submit fees to the Department throughout the year, which are the DNR portion of the fees they collect from the mine permitting process. The basic data is currently entered and stored in an MS Word document, which is then routed to staff for their review. The NR135 Subteam has agreed that the current approach does not meet their needs, and that an additional module to the current Access database should be created to track fees information. The analysis necessary for this module is already under way and the file manager/programmer has workplanned hours to continue the development.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort, and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of the NR135 application and database that has been developed using MS Access would need to be modified in the future and migrated to Oracle to continue to function and meet broadening program needs.

How & When: This effort is sponsored by the NR135 Subteam Leader Tom Portle and involves the NR135 file manager, John Sissons, and input from the rest of the NR135 Subteam. If the initial analysis and design is completed by the end of August, the test module would be available before the end of October and the application could be functional and in production by January 2005.

Workload/Resources: The analysis and initial design workload could be as much as 30 hours or more for John Sissons with 5 or less hours of time from Tom Portle and other NR135 Subteam staff input. There would then be ten hours time for John to finish a test prototype for staff evaluation. A total of less than five hours would then be needed for evaluation by the NR135 Subteam. Bug fixes and modifications to the initial design, and migration to production, would require ten more hours of John's time. Total programming time 50 hours. Total NR135 Subteam staff contribution 10 hours or less.

Back to Issue Paper

Electronic Submittal of Hazardous Waste Manifest Facility Data from TSDs

What (advantages & disadvantages): The Waste Management Program has spent tens of thousands of dollars a year on data entry of hazardous waste manifest information. Recognizing the EPA has a nationwide effort underway to establish electronic manifests and that, by their nature, manifests are documents that must pass from entity to entity often crossing state lines, the program has initiated an effort to collect much of the important manifest information from the Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) facilities electronically in a process similar to that used for GEMS data. This effort will be voluntary to start with, but will be encouraged for all in-state TSDs and may be made available to out-of-state TSDs that take waste from Wisconsin generators. When our rules changes go into effect, electronic data submittal by in-state TSDs will become mandatory.

It is possible that the on-going program redesign effort and the program data modeling effort could necessitate that some or all of this effort would need to be modified in the future.

How & When: This effort is lead by the Hazardous Waste Team Leader, Pat Chabot, and the SHWIMS File Manager, Aggie Cook, with the involvement of Sandy Miller, the Hazardous Waste Team, and the programmer, Kathy Mooney. Given current progress on this issue, it is likely to become available for testing by TSDs as early as November 2004, and in production before the end of the year.

Workload/Resources: The initial additional workload could be as much as 10 hours or more for Pat Chabot, Aggie Cook, and Sandy Miller. It is expected to require about 30 hours of Aggie Cook's time to finalize the format for submittal, complete the programming of an upload routine, and address bugs and fixes.